

From: [Wyatt, Robert](#)
To: [Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com](#); [Ron.Gouquet@noaa.gov](#)
Cc: [voster@anchorenv.com](#); [erin.madden@gmail.com](#); [Chip.Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [mlewis@newfields.com](#); [krista.koehl@portofportland.com](#)
Subject: Re: Final: Thursday meeting update and question
Date: 04/05/2006 09:37 AM

Yes, I will inform the group this morning.

-----Original Message-----

From: McKenna, James (Jim) <Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com>
To: Ron.Gouquet@noaa.gov <Ron.Gouquet@noaa.gov>
CC: voster@anchorenv.com <voster@anchorenv.com>; erin.madden@gmail.com <erin.madden@gmail.com>; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov <Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov>; Wyatt, Robert <rjw@nwnatural.com>; Lewis, Mark <mlewis@newfields.com>; Koehl, Krista <Krista.Koehl@portofportland.com>
Sent: Wed Apr 05 09:33:47 2006
Subject: Re: Final: Thursday meeting update and question

Thanks Ron. Bob, I'm assuming you'll share this with Exec this morning, and Valerie will inform our tech team. Thanks, Jim.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ron Gouquet
To: McKenna, James (Jim)
CC: voster@anchorenv.com; erin.madden@gmail.com; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; rjw@nwnatural.com; Lewis, Mark; Koehl, Krista
Sent: Wed Apr 05 08:39:02 2006
Subject: Final: Thursday meeting update and question

Hi y'all:

Looks like a constructive format for Th's meeting will be free discussion & Q&A with LWG on how to potentially resolve lamprey & sturgeon questions .

Groundrule proposal: 'stipulate' that further discussions will need to occur with all players and decisions will need to be made in some envisioned future (soon) meeting; e.g., we may have a largish parking lot..

We'll play it by ear if we want to continue with the remaining 'potential partners' from LWG to continue the discussion, when Jim drops off, but generally we maybe should shoot for about an hour & a half to discuss the ideas & talk about how to approach an upcoming Lamprey Sturgeon (framework?) summit?. Something like a schedule of 0900-1030 with LWG & continue from 10-12 with co-trustees, EPA OK, as needed?

Th 4/6/06 @ 0900 using the NOAA line **nonresponsiv** Participant Passcode: **nonresp**
OK?
Ron

McKenna, James (Jim) wrote:

> Hi Ron, (b) (6)

> I appreciate your concerns about the Thursday meeting. The
> LWG is responding to an invitation from the Trustees to attend this
> meeting, so if you feel the Trustees need more time we can be
> accommodating. However, just to be clear, the LWG is not coming to
> this meeting with hardened positions. It was our understanding that
> the Trustees, EPA and its partners, and the LWG would come to the
> meeting with open minds to discuss what we already know about lamprey,
> what we need to know, and options to get there.
> We are very interested to hear each parties views and ideas, and then
> take that information under consideration over the next few weeks in
> order to help develop a path forward.
> I am comfortable proceeding with your suggested meeting format. I
> will call in Thursday for the first hour. The logistics (e.g.,
> call-in number) should be coordinated with Valerie Thompson Oster.
> Thanks, Jim.

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Ron Gouguet
> To: Valerie Oster
> CC: Erin Madden; Chip; McKenna, James (Jim); Bob Wyatt
> Sent: Tue Apr 04 12:03:55 2006
> Subject: Re: Thursday meeting update and question

> Valerie:
> We really need the extra time. How about this, we schedule ~1 hour
> with LWG when Jim can call. If he has to drop off, fine. We won't be
> able to talk a long time, but just touching base is probably useful, as
> long as everyone realizes we are brainstorming. Is there a number
> (y'all's?) we can all use? We can do a 30min focussed presentation
> possibly as a peek at where the ideas are at this point on filling the
> information holes in our datasets. Y'all may want to drop off too so we
> can each chat among ourselves, while ideas are fresh in our minds -
> let's just try not to harden positions but think of possible resolutions
> for the question raised.

> OK?
> ROn
> Valerie Oster wrote:

> >Hi Ron,
> >

> >I have communicated with Jim McKenna and Bob Wyatt, and the LWG
> preference would be to keep the meeting as scheduled for April 6. Jim
> is comfortable with the Port being represented by others in his
> absence, and he will be calling in for about 30-60 minutes in the
> beginning of the day.

> >
> >Thanks,
> >Valerie

> >
> >Valerie Thompson Oster
> >Anchor Environmental, L.L.C
> >6650 SW Redwood Lane, Suite 110
> >Portland, OR 97224
> >Phone: 503-670-1108 x19
> >Fax: 503-670-1128

> >
> >This electronic message transmission contains information that is a
> >confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of

> >litigation. The information is intended to be for the use of the
> individual
> >or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be
> aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the
> contents of
> this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic
> transmission in error, please notify us by electronic mail at
> voster@anchorenv.com.
>
>
> _____
>
>
> >From: Ron Gouguet [<mailto:Ron.Gouguet@noaa.gov>]
> >Sent: Tue 4/4/2006 9:50 AM
> >To: Erin Madden; Chip; Valerie Oster; McKenna, James (Jim)
> >Subject: Re: Thursday meeting update and question
>
>
>
>
> >Hi Valerie - Can you stand down for now on the Th date? Spoke to Erin &
> we want to find a time when Jim McKenna can participate in the next 2
> weeks. Can you check on that availability (with other LWG members?)
> I'll check with Rick @ COP. Thanks! Sorry for the confusion
>
> >Unfortunately I just sent an email to Valerie Oster and Chip H.
> confirming
> the meeting on Thursday. I do not have time to attempt to re-schedule
> this
> today. I understand the concerns, but at this late date, rescheduling is
> going to be difficult. It took me five days to get calls back from Jim
> McKenna and get confirmation from Valerie Oster that five LWG members
> could
> make this meeting on Thursday. If someone is able to do it, I would start
> with Jim and Rick and find out their availability, then run those
> dates by
> us and EPA. Does someone have time to do that today?
>
>
>
>
>
>
>